

REMARKS

Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 remain in the present application. Claims 13, 15-16, 18, 20, 22, 26, 28-29, 31, 33 and 35 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on March 25, 2009 between Examiner Cory Almeida and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview that Penz does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements including "dynamically determining a transmissivity of a second region of said second display screen for causing presentation of said portion of said image in accordance with said image characteristic," the combination of elements including "a second display screen operable to dynamically adjust a transmissivity of a second region of said second display screen for modifying said display of said image in accordance with an image characteristic," the combination of elements including "dynamically determining a transmissivity of a second region of said non-display layer for causing presentation of said portion of said image in accordance with said image characteristic," and the combination of elements including "a non-display layer operable to dynamically adjust a transmissivity of a second region of said non-display layer for modifying said display of said image in accordance with an

image characteristic.” Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Number 4,364,039 to Penz (referred to herein as “Penz). It was agreed during the Examiner Interview that Penz does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “dynamically determining a transmissivity of a second region of said second display screen for causing presentation of said portion of said image in accordance with said image characteristic,” the combination of elements including “a second display screen operable to dynamically adjust a transmissivity of a second region of said second display screen for modifying said display of said image in accordance with an image characteristic,” the combination of elements including “dynamically determining a transmissivity of a second region of said non-display layer for causing presentation of said portion of said image in accordance with said image characteristic,” and the combination of elements including “a non-display layer operable to dynamically adjust a transmissivity of a second region of said non-display layer for modifying said display of said image in accordance with an image characteristic.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Penz fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “dynamically adjusting a second region of said second display screen for causing presentation of said portion of said image in accordance with said image characteristic” as recited in

independent Claim 13, the combination of elements including “a second display screen operable to dynamically adjust a second region of said second display screen for modifying said display of said image in accordance with an image characteristic” as recited in independent Claim 20, the combination of elements including “dynamically adjusting a second region of said non-display layer for causing presentation of said portion of said image in accordance with said image characteristic” as recited in independent Claim 26, and the combination of elements including “a non-display layer operable to dynamically adjust a second region of said non-display layer for modifying said display of said image in accordance with an image characteristic” as recited in independent Claim 33.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 13, 20, 26 and 33 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Penz. Since Claims 14-16, 18-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-32, 34-35 and 37-38 depend from and recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14-16, 18-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-32, 34-35 and 37-38 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Penz. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are allowable.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record.

However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 6 / 2 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060